

The Salisbury Planning Board held its regular meeting Tuesday, July 10, 2007, in the City Council Chamber of the Salisbury City Hall at 4 p.m. with the following being present and absent:

PRESENT: Robert Cockerl, Tommy Hairston, Richard Huffman, Craig Neuhardt, Sandy Reitz, Jeff Smith, Valarie Stewart, Albert Stout and Diane Young

ABSENT: Karen Alexander, Dr. Mark Beymer, and Price Wagoner

STAFF: Dan Mikkelson, Preston Mitchell, Diana Moghrabi, and David Phillips

MEDIA: Mark Wineka / *Salisbury Post*

Vice Chairman Diane Young called the meeting to order and Tommy Hairston offered the invocation. The minutes of the June 26, 2007, meeting were approved as published. The Planning Board adopted the agenda as published.

NEW BUSINESS

Diane Young read the explanation of procedure and Preston Mitchell made a staff presentation for the two following map amendments. Preston Mitchell, Sam Meredith, and Dan Roach were sworn in for testimony. The Board did not have any ex parte communications. There will be two recommendations to City Council: 1) to rezone our zoning map, 2) recommendation of the special use permit.

A. ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

Z-05S-07 Salisbury Holding Group, LLC
174 Enon Church Road
Tax Map - Parcel(s) 329-0280001, 329-409

Approximately seven acres, encompassing two parcels located along the north side of Enon Church Road, approx. 1/3-mile west of Woodleaf Road and directly across from White Oaks Drive. Located in the ETJ.

Request to rezone all of one parcel (329-409) and a portion of a larger parcel (329-0280001) from AGRICULTURE zoning to SPECIAL BUSINESS (A-1 to B-1-S) zoning to allow for the construction of a 118-unit Retirement Facility.

Proposed Zoning:

B-1-S district *Special office institutional act (B-1-S)*. The office institutional district is intended primarily for the location of businesses of a service type which do not maintain a stock of goods for sale or retail trade. The *Special* aspect of this district is identical to B-1 district, except that a Special Use Permit is required, which may allow one or more permitted uses that are permitted

by right in the B-1 district. City council may place additional provisions or restrictions on the Special Use Permit.

Existing Zoning:

Agricultural district (A-1)–The agricultural district is intended primarily as a district for bona fide farms and their related uses, provided such uses are an integral part of a specific bona fide farm. The continuance of agricultural endeavors and forestry are encouraged within this district.

The Special Use District (S-District) rezoning process is a conditional zoning tool that must be voluntarily petitioned for by the property owner. This method of zoning allows the petitioner to seek specific uses within the underlying base zoning district. The S-District process requires two actions: 1) Amending the official City Zoning Map, and 2) Issuance of a Special Use District (S-District) Permit that is linked in perpetuity to the rezoning and runs with the land. In addition, the City Council has the authority to impose reasonable and appropriate conditions on the property that would run with the land. These conditions and the associated permit can be amended or revoked by the Council at any time in the future subject to specific criteria.

The evaluation and approval of the Special Use Permit must be governed by quasi-judicial proceedings, which are based upon the sworn testimony and evidence presented at the hearing relevant to the following:

The use meets all required principles and specifications of the Ordinance and any adopted land use plans and is in harmony with the general purpose and intent and preserves its spirit; and

The proposed plan as submitted will be visually and functionally compatible to the surrounding area; and

The public health, safety, and welfare will be assured and the proposed development will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property and associated uses if located where proposed.

Adjacent land uses and zoning

<i>Location</i>	<i>Existing Land Uses</i>	<i>Existing Zoning</i>
North of property	Vacant Land & Rural Residential	A-1 & County
East of property	Rural Residential	A-1
South of property	Suburban Residential (Westcliffe)	R-20
West of property	Vacant Land & Rural Residential	A-1

One of the petitioned parcels is already developed with a small single-family residence and small out-building. The remaining parcel remains undeveloped and largely devoid of trees.

Salisbury 2000 Strategic Growth Plan

Office & Institutional Development The office and institutional development category provides for offices, institutions, commercial activities not involving the sale of merchandise, and higher density residential uses. Office and institutional areas are intended to serve two major functions. The first is to provide a support function for commercial areas. The second function is to provide a transitional land use between residential uses and land uses which are more intensive.

Policy 6.1 Office and institutional development may be encouraged to locate as a transitional land use between activities of higher intensity and those of lower intensity.

Residential Development Residential development policies for the Strategic Growth Plan reflect a variety of issues and priorities for housing in the City of Salisbury. Foremost among all issues was the need to conscientiously protect existing viable neighborhoods as an important component of Salisbury's history and quality of life. Residents participating in the public involvement process for the Strategic Growth Plan felt strongly that commercial encroachment into residential areas continued to be a problem in the city.

Regarding high-density residential development, the policies reflect the planning principle that such high-density uses must have available adequate urban services. In addition to centralized water and sewer services, high-density residential development must be provided with direct access to major thoroughfares and/or transit systems. Such development should also be located near existing or planned concentrations of employment, schools and shopping. Finally, the public involvement process revealed that three population groups in particular were felt to have special needs for the provision of adequate housing. While not wishing to exclude the housing needs of other population groups, the Strategic Growth Plan policies identify the elderly, the handicapped, and low to moderate-income households as warranting special consideration through the city's programs and policies.

Water and sewer service is currently available to the petition area. Landscaping development in the B-1-S district will be required to provide a C-buffer yard (15') with Complete Visual Separation against the abutting A-1 district. Enon Church Road is a minor thoroughfare. A proposed senior retirement center's traffic Generation is about 3.48 vehicles per day (vpd) per unit, (Meaning possibility of 411 vpd for this facility)

Staff believes that this petition is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the 2000 Strategic Growth Plan and the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan; therefore, staff recommends approval of the petition.

Those speaking in opposition: None

Those speaking in favor:

Dan Roach with Curry Brandaw Architects, 471 High Street SE, Salem, Oregon, represented the applicant. He pointed out some of the highlights of the proposal. Holiday is the management company that would operate the facility. They are offering a catered lifestyle to seniors. The services would include three meals a day, seven days a week, van service, a variety of physical and social activities. There are opportunities for seniors to get out into the community. Housekeeping and on-site management would be provided.

Residents are typically in their 80s, most are single and in good health. They do not drive and often have family within ten miles of the facility. They are coming, not for medical need, but by choice for a sense of community.

Mr. Roach distributed a few booklets to the Planning Board that described the project. They like the proximity to the single-family neighborhood. The building and grounds would be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The facility is positioned on the site to minimize the impact on the neighborhood. There is a significant amount of open space between the neighbors and the facility. They propose a park-like setting. Managers live on site. This would be a low traffic generator.

Sam Meredith of 2542 Enoch Road approves of the plan. He met with the company's attorney, Mr. Mike Davis, and is very impressed with the proposal. Mr. Meredith is concerned about the possibility of annexation. He built his house about six years ago and loves his 16 acres.

Staff responded that annexation is not required, but development in the ETJ which is contiguous to the city line is generally annexed voluntarily.

Board Discussion

Sandy Reitz asked about annexation water/sewer policies which staff offered to discuss outside of the meeting with someone from staff more qualified to address the questions.

Craig Neuhardt went on record saying, "I have a real strong bias against zoning away from A-1 if at all possible, but an area like this where you take a 7-acre chunk today, what is going to happen with the rest of the area? Will it all eventually be more of a hodge-podge of development rather than something that is consistent?" Is piecemeal the right way to go when we are dealing with this type of property?

Dick Huffman asked if there were plans for future development. Mr. Roach responded that there are some indications of plans. There are ideas for senior garden living opportunities. There was concern about how White Oak would wrap around the site. The short answer is they do not have any concrete plans of what might happen.

Jeff Smith it is not often we get an opportunity to see development like this in what is an undeveloped area. The decision made today starts to determine what may happen in the rest of the A-1. He appreciates limited use of the request—Straight B-1 would be a lot harder to agree to. He does question somewhat the three-story height. Overall, the design elements that are at least presented now allow for consistency with our Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan. He would be in favor of recommending approval.

This is a different type of high-density use than an apartment complex. Obviously trip generation would be considerably less. Westcliffe is not a bashful neighborhood and no one from there is speaking against this request.

Diane Young echoed what Mr. Smith said—that she is much more comfortable with an “S” district. Architecturally speaking they have done a good job demonstrating a quality project that fits well in the residential area. It appears that they have done a good job locating the building on the site leaving a lot of green space around the building, limiting the parking and putting the parking in the rear instead of the front. Transitioning is being accomplished with this use. She is leaning toward voting in favor of the rezoning.

Planning Board Statement Of Consistency and Motion:

Jeff Smith made a MOTION that The Planning Board finds and determines that rezoning petition Z-05S-07 is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Strategic Growth Plan and the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan, and hereby recommends approval.

Tommy Hairston seconded the motion with all members voting AYE. (9-0)

Jeff Smith said that he is looking forward to seeing the site plan tied to this proposal; this is not the last chance to have site plan consideration. He is reluctant to tie this site plan today (preliminary) to this “S” District. He trusts the process. Mr. Smith went on to make a MOTION that the Salisbury Planning Board recommend approval of the special use district permit for Z-05S-07 requiring the single use of retirement facility as presented in the petition based on the following finding of facts:

That the proposed use or development of the land will not materially endanger the public health or safety and will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property;

That the proposed use or development of the land is reasonably consistent with the strategic plan, comprehensive plan, and other official plans adopted by the city;

That adequate provisions and design have been made or will be made to ensure automotive and pedestrian safety and convenience, inter- and intra-connectivity, traffic flow and control, emergency vehicle access, and adequate ingress and egress; and

That the proposed use is appropriately located with respect to transportation facilities, water supply, fire and police protection, waste disposal, and similar facilities, and that adequate provisions have been or will be made to reasonably address any adverse impact on such facilities.

Albert Stout seconded the motion with all members voting AYE. (9-0)

This will move forward to City Council August 7, 2007, with a recommendation to approve the map amendment as well as the recommendation to approve the "S" district permit.

Zoning Map Amendment

Z-06-07 Brian and Jocelyn Moore
530 West D Avenue
Tax Map - Parcel(s) 061-2011, 061-2017

Request to rezone the two properties from SINGLE-FAMILY
RESIDENTIAL zoning to DUPLEX RESIDENTIAL zoning.

Approximately two acres, encompassing two parcels located along the east side of Sherwood Avenue between Mooresville Road (Hwy 150) and West D Avenue.

Proposed Zoning:

R-6 district *Two-family residential district (R-6)*. The two-family residential district is intended primarily as a residential district including detached single-family houses and duplexes along with their customary accessory buildings and structures and to establish areas for a density of development relative to the lot size requirements of this district. This would allow for daycare homes and daycare facilities.

Existing Zoning:

R-8 district *Single family-8 residential district (R-8)*. The single-family-8 residential (R-8) district is intended primarily for detached single-family dwellings and their customary accessory buildings or structures and to establish areas for a density of development relative to the lot size requirements of this district.

Adjacent Land Uses and Zoning

<i>Location</i>	<i>Existing Land Uses</i>	<i>Existing Zoning</i>
North of property	Residential across Mooresville Road (Hwy-150)	R-8
East of property	Residential	R-8
South of property	Residential across West 'D' Avenue	R-8
West of property	Residential across Sherwood Street	R-8

Salisbury 2000 Strategic Growth Plan

Residential development policies for the Strategic Growth Plan reflect a variety of issues and priorities for housing in the City of Salisbury. Foremost among all issues was the need to conscientiously protect existing viable neighborhoods as an important component of Salisbury's history and quality of life. Residents participating in the public involvement process for the Strategic Growth Plan felt strongly that commercial encroachment into residential areas continued to be a problem in the city.

Regarding housing types, there continues to be strong support for the traditional single-family home as a major housing source in Salisbury. The Strategic Growth Plan does not discourage, however, the use of flexible or innovative land planning techniques when such land planning can better preserve the natural topography, vegetation, or other natural attributes of a given site.

Regarding high-density residential development, the policies reflect the planning principle that such high-density uses must have available adequate urban services. In addition to centralized water and sewer services, high-density residential development must be provided with direct access to major thoroughfares and/or transit systems. Such development should also be located near existing or planned concentrations of employment, schools and shopping. Finally, the public involvement process revealed that three population groups in particular were felt to have special needs for the provision of adequate housing. While not wishing to exclude the housing needs of other population groups, the Strategic Growth Plan policies identify the elderly, the handicapped, and low to moderate-income households as warranting special consideration through the city's programs and policies.

Salisbury Vision 2020 Plan

Salisbury's newer existing neighborhoods refer to those parts of the City developed during the period from just after World War II to the present day. Examples of such neighborhoods include Fairview Heights, Sedgefield Acres, Meadowbrook, and Country Club Hills. Generally, these neighborhoods exhibit many of the ideals of post-war suburban America with relatively large

lots and lawn areas, homes, often one story, set well back from the street. Outdoor activity spaces are oriented toward the backyard, with the front yard serving primarily an aesthetic function.

The automobile orientation of these neighborhoods can be observed by the prominence of driveways and garages in home and site design. There is generally an absence of sidewalks, except perhaps, a private walk from the driveway to the front door. On-street parking is usually frowned upon, except as necessary for large gatherings. Service and delivery functions such as for mail, newspaper, and refuse collection are normally located at the street edge and near the end of the driveway.

Staff Comment

This neighborhood is one that developed after the end of WW-II and generally fits the "Vision 2020" description above. However, it is located in an area that is realizing steady urbanization. We believe that this area, in general, will continue to urbanize and increase in density due to increased development pressures; therefore, it is critical to observe and monitor this intensification so as to not negatively impact existing, viable neighborhoods—whether "new" or historic.

There are no specific policies under Newer, Existing Neighborhoods to address residential to residential zoning petitions, but the densification from single-family housing to two-family housing is something to carefully consider.

The R-6 and R-8 zoning lines follow the 1950 annexation boundary.

Uses Permitted By District

Single-Family Residential District (R-8).

Within the Single-Family Residential District (R-8) the following uses shall be permitted and within the Special Single-Family Residential District (R-8-S) the following uses may be permitted:

- Single-family dwellings. [FF]
- Single Family-8 Residential. [R-8]
- Child day care homes, in accordance with the procedures outlined in section 7.01(5)(c) and approved in the special use permit. [H]
- Modular homes, as defined in section 4.02. [FF]
- Churches and related uses. [E]
- Public elementary [P], middle [P], and high schools [EE], and private schools having curricula approximately the same as ordinarily given in public schools.
- Golf courses, parks, playgrounds and community centers operated on a noncommercial or nonprofit basis for recreational purposes only.
- Golf courses, with provisions as outlined in section 12.13. [NR]
- Community centers. [M]
- Greenhouses and truck gardens which are incidental to the residential use and conducted on a noncommercial basis only. [NR]

- Home occupations such as home cooking and professional offices as defined in article IV, section 4.02, of this ordinance. [NR]
- Accessory buildings or structures with the following provisions:
 - (a) Location to be in a rear yard area only, except for swimming pools, detached garages and carports, which may also be located in the side yard.
 - (b) Setback shall not be less than ten (10) feet from any property line, and in the case of corner lots the setback from any side street right-of-way shall be at least twenty (20) feet.
 - (c) No accessory structure shall be larger than or taller than the principal structure on the lot. [NR]
- Accessory dwelling units, with the following provisions:
 - (a) Only one (1) accessory dwelling unit shall be permitted on a lot, within the existing footprint of a secondary structure at least five (5) years old.
 - (b) Principal building must be at least two thousand (2,000) square feet in size.
 - (c) Accessory unit shall not exceed thirty (30) percent of the size of the principal building.
 - (d) Owner of the lot shall occupy as their primary residence either the principal building or the accessory dwelling unit. [NR]
 - Swimming pools, as provided for in section 12.30.
 - Family care home. [FF]
 - Residential treatment facility, level I, II, or III, with a special use permit as provided for in section 7.10(3)g. [DD]
 - Supervised living facility, with no more than six (6) clients. [FF]
 - Bed and breakfast home in accordance with the provisions contained in section 12.24, regulations for the use bed and breakfast home. [CA]
 - Police substations that are in a Redevelopment target area as designated by city council and that are designed to be compatible with the neighborhood. [FF]
 - Neighborhood centers. [OO]

Section 8.13. Two-Family Residential District (R-6).

Within the Two-Family Residential District (R-6) the following uses shall be permitted and within the Special Two-Family Residential District (R-6-S) the following uses may be permitted: All uses permitted in a single-family residential district (R-8) unless otherwise authorized to a different extent by a specific permitted use reference or stipulation for this district.

- Adult day care home provided such use has a current valid certification by the N.C. Department of Human Resources, that there shall be no more than five (5) clients in residence at any one time, and such use is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing adult day care home. [B]
- Two-family dwellings. [BB]
- Child day care homes, provided there is a valid state license and there is at least 100 square feet of outdoor play area for each child. [H]
- Child day care facilities, in accordance with the procedures outlined in section 7.01(5)(c) and approved in the special use permit. [H]
- Accessory buildings or structures with the following provisions:
 - (a) Location to be in a rear yard area only, except for swimming pools, detached garages and carports, which may also be located in the side yard.

- (b) Setback shall not be less than five (5) feet from any property line, and in the case of corner lots the setback from any side street right-of-way shall be at least twenty (20) feet.
- (c) No accessory structure shall be larger than or taller than the principal structure on the lot. [NR]

Within the two-family residential district (R-6), the following conditional use may be permitted:

- Residential support facility [o], provided that:
 - (1) The facility adjoins, meaning to a side, rear or across the street from, a hospital.
 - (2) The occupancy of the facility be limited to no more than fifteen (15) families or individuals.
 - (3) The size of the property is at least twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, with at least one hundred (100) feet along any public street.
 - (4) Building coverage of the lot does exceed 20 percent.
 - (5) The minimum yard requirements and maximum height limitation for two-family use, as listed in section 11.01, table of requirements, for the R-6 use, are met.
 - (6) If a sign is needed, said sign be in accordance with the residential sign table in section 9.05(8)(c).
 - (7) The Zoning Board of Adjustment may attach additional restrictive conditions, as listed in section 17.06(4).

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the petition is not consistent with the city's strategic growth plan based on its calling primarily for single family traditional large-lot housing; however it is consistent with the "Vision 2020" goals for a variety of housing types, controlled densification, and the recognition that large lot subdivisions cannot be the sole form of future residential development in the city. Staff recommends approval of the petition with the inclusion of all other parcels in the 500 block of "D" Avenue. If rezoned as requested, there would be a stripe of R-8 down the center of the block.

In the State of North Carolina, Planning Board, the property owner, a third party, and City Council can request to rezone properties.

Those speaking in opposition:

The following is an email received by the Planning Office.

Dear Mr. Mitchell,

I found out today (July 2) that you are out of the office until after the Fourth of July, and I will be unavailable after that, so I am writing my concerns to you. I regret that no one from my household will be able to attend the courtesy hearing on Tuesday, July 10. But I hope our interests will be included in the considerations of the Salisbury Planning Board. I have copied this letter to Board Secretary Diana Moghrabi to facilitate communication with board members.

We have learned that changing from R-6 (single family residential) to R-8 (duplex residential) will allow some of these additions to the property:

1. Adult day care
2. Two-family residences
3. Child day care facility
4. Residential support facility (sort of like Ronald McDonald house)

The current residents have a large home on one section of the property and have a child daycare home business in it. This has not been a problem, but I understand that with approval a much larger facility could be built, limited only in number of children by what a state agency would determine. This could mean a larger facility, off-street parking, staff and parents coming and going, etc in much larger numbers than is now the case. That would really change the character of a small, quiet neighborhood that we now enjoy. Since I have not heard from the Moores what their plans are, this is my best guess.

However, I would also be opposed to the building of one or more duplex dwellings. All of the homes in our part of the neighborhood are single-family residences and most are owner occupied. Changing to rental property is almost always a detraction in a small area for later home sales to single families. Near the Main Street end of D Avenue is at least one duplex and there is rental property up there. In some ways it's almost a different neighborhood in character and upkeep. I have one close neighbor who moved just to our end of the street from the other many years ago for that sole reason.

I ask you to please not insert a small sectional zone into our area that is currently zoned R-8.

Thank you most cordially,

Marianne Summey
611 D Avenue
Salisbury, NC 28144

Those speaking in favor:

Brian and Jocelyn Moore (petitioners) are in favor of the rezoning on the basis of having more children in the daycare. When they first came to get the special use permit to have a daycare in the home they spoke to all of the neighbors, and they believed that the neighbors understood their intentions.

There is a need for more daycare services; there is a specific need for in-home daycare services. R-8 zoning only allows eight children daytime children and three afterschool children. The R-6 allows a maximum of 15 children (just a few extra). They have the room and qualify in every other way. The difference is between the terms "daycare home" and "daycare facility." The "daycare facility" is not a by-right use; they would still need to seek a special use permit at City Council.

David Phillips did not recall any child daycare facilities in the home in Salisbury, but the ordinance does not distinguish that it cannot be associated with an at home use/type. We have plenty of stand-alone. Preston called the State about the issue and found out that a child daycare facility can operate out of a home that is a primary residence; they have to get a different license and meet requirements from the State.

Preston Mitchell received a phone call from Margaret Antosek who is unable to leave her home. She stated that she is supportive of Brian and Jocelyn Moore and their daycare, but she has concerns for the potential duplex development. She recognizes that this is not an "S" district but a general rezoning so all uses need to be considered. She had concerns for development increases along Hwy 150. She specifically noted Salisbury Village has increased traffic, and this rezoning would have significant impact on Sherwood in the future. She expressed concerns that D Avenue and Sherwood have become shortcuts between Hwy 29 and Hwy 150. She had concerns about a creek affecting future development of their vacant parcel, but staff explained that is not really associated with the zoning; that would be a development issue.

Board Discussion

Robert Cockerl had concerns about including the staff recommendation of adding the other parcels in the block to the R-6 rezoning. He is not comfortable about making the recommendation without public notification. (Notifications would go to property owners for the City Council Public Hearing.)

Sandy Reitz is also concerned with that situation. She hears the Moores, and said she understands the need for the daycare and believes in home daycare. Sandy has concerns that this is just the beginning. This opens the door for the Moores not being there. What happens if they move or retire? You are left with zoning that could jeopardize the neighborhood.

Jeff Smith is a strong advocate for daycare facilities in homes. He understands the need, but he has concerns that echo what Sandy said and he concurs with staff's recommendation to clean up the zoning. If Planning Board is forced to vote on this today, he would vote to deny because of the rezoning of the other parcels and the affect on the future of the neighborhood.

Albert Stout made a MOTION to send the proposal to Legislative Committee B (Sandy Reitz, Albert Stout, Price Wagoner, Diane Young, Tommy Hairston, and Craig Neuhardt) for additional review. Sandy Reitz seconded the motion with all members voting AYE. (9-0)

The committee was scheduled to meet at 8 a.m. Wednesday, July 18, in the first floor conference room at City Hall, 217 South Main Street.

B. Group Developments

David Phillips made staff presentations for the following Group Developments. The approved cases will go before City Council on the consent agenda July 17, 2007.

G-09-07 Artz Properties
1504 Jake Alexander Blvd. West
Tax Map 450, Parcel 045, Zoning M-1

Mr. David Artz of Salisbury submitted the application for the addition of a 14,396 square-foot retail center to include seven units located at 1504 Jake Alexander Boulevard West. All zoning criteria have been met. It was recommended that a five-foot sidewalk be installed along Industrial Avenue. The developer has included the sidewalk on the site plan. A sidewalk along Jake Alexander Boulevard was discussed, but staff felt due to the current conditions, the cost of the sidewalk would be a financial hardship for the developer. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommends approval to the Planning Board of the application, with the following recommendations.

In accordance with the City's Comprehensive Plan (Community Appearance Vision Statement and Policies C-19, CC-1 and CC-2), TRC recommends to the Planning Board that improved architecture be utilized for the building.

Planning Division staff has considerable concerns about this submittal in terms of its architectural compatibility with the broader vision expressed by citizens through the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Vision 2020 recognizes that many newer, existing commercial areas were designed and built in ways that are not in sync with the current desire for human-scaled, architecturally appealing buildings that add to the overall character of the community. Case in point, much of the older development along Jake Alexander Boulevard is representative of the typical highway commercial strip pattern of development that the recommendations of "Vision 2020" are meant to overcome.

New additions and redevelopment provide an opportunity to correct past mistakes; unfortunately, the proposed building elevations repeat some of the undesirable elements of the existing building façade. Some of those elements include the lack of architectural fenestration such as bays or column details which could help create visual interest on large expanses of wall surfaces and parapets, the lack of architectural detail near the windows, doors and other areas of human interaction, and the absence of a definable expression of style reflected through complimentary details, features, textures or materials.

They had a meeting with NCDOT and they will be required to make some site modifications. Landscaping will be added (up to code) and parking will be restriped.

Those speaking in opposition: NONE

Those speaking in favor:

David and Janie Artz, of 2100 Clark Road, bought this property three years ago. One year ago they had the property reappraised and found they were underutilizing the property. This led to the plan to make a retail center.

They will be adding green half-moon awnings on each individual doorway and windows. The elevations did not indicate this; she apologized for this. This should be sufficient for the architectural features. Neon will be added to the top of the building on the front. Each business would get a sign above their awning.

They hope to add a nail salon, tanning beds, and a cosmetic store.

Mr. Stout believed that their improvements “show up” other buildings on that side of the road. Sandy Reitz agrees with the Vision 2020 plan and appreciates the staff recommendation. Who do we start with regarding architectural enhancements? Diane Young said she does not shy away from things being aesthetically pleasing; she does not feel this is detracting from the surroundings. It is either compatible or potentially a little better than what is around it. For this one case she is having difficulty asking them to go beyond the requirements without a design-based code.

Valarie Stewart made a MOTION for the Planning Board to recommend approval of G-09-07 as submitted. Robert Cockerl seconded the motion with all members voting AYE. (9-0)

G-03-86 Salisbury Marketplace (Former Rack Room)
2120 Statesville Blvd.
Tax Map 331-C, Parcel 023, Zoning B-7

Mr. Andy Beauchamp of Mocksville submitted the application for the construction of a 450-square-foot addition to the existing facility located at 2120 Statesville Boulevard. All zoning criteria have been met. This is a small addition but because of the zoning they are required to go through the Group Development process. There is no affect on the parking or the landscaping. The TRC recommends approval to the Planning Board of the application, as submitted.

Those speaking in opposition: NONE

Those speaking in favor: NONE

Albert Stout made a MOTION for the Planning Board to recommend approval of G-03-86 as submitted. The motion was seconded with all members voting AYE. (9-0)

G-12-00 Pinnacle Office Park Phase III
310 & 320 Jake Alexander Blvd. West
Tax Map 061, Parcel 217, Zoning B-1 w/GD-A Overlay

Mr. Luke Fisher submitted the application for the construction of two commercial buildings to include eight potential tenants with a combined total of 16,167 square feet and a 107-space parking lot to be located at the 310 and 320 Jake Alexander Boulevard West. All zoning criteria have been met. The TRC recommends approval of the application to the Planning Board, as submitted.

Staff stated this site contributes storm water runoff to a known drainage problem on Sunset Drive, and development will increase the amount of the runoff. However, the contribution from this site is small in comparison to the full drainage basin, and no specific treatment is required or recommended.

The applicant is still proposing connectivity that will run parallel to Jake Alexander Boulevard. They are proposing two access drives instead the one as originally approved. They are using alternate methods of compliance on landscaping that meets the intent of the code. There is a 6-foot stockade fence with Leland cypress tree plantings which provides complete visual separation between this and the existing single-family neighborhood. This matches what has already been in place.

There is a previously approved plan for this site. Staff recommends that upon approval of this revised site plan, the previously approved site plan shall become null and void.

Those speaking in opposition: NONE

Those speaking in favor: NONE

Albert Stout made a MOTION for the Planning Board to recommend approval of G-12-00 as submitted with the staff recommendation that the previously approved plan become null and void. Jeff Smith seconded the motion with all members voting AYE. (9-0)

OTHER BOARD BUSINESS

The text amendment for signs has not been dropped and staff hopes it is still coming to the Planning Board at the next meeting.


There will be a Planning Board training session Wednesday, July 25, at 8 a.m. that will last about two hours and will be at the Plaza Seminar Room at 100 W. Innes Street on the second floor.

Tommy Hairston invited everyone to an open house and dedication of a new funeral home at 703 S. Main Street, Sunday at 3 p.m.

There being no further business to come before the Planning Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Beymer", written over a horizontal line.

Dr. Mark Beymer, Chair



Diane Young, Vice Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Diana Moghrabi", written over a horizontal line.

Secretary, Diana Moghrabi